

Commissioner for Patents  
Page 12

Serial No.: 09/642,671

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

#### *Claim Rejections -35USC § 102*

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wiener et al. in United States Patent No. 6,324,264. Claims 1 and 5 are cancelled and the subject matter thereof incorporated in claim 7. Claim 2 is amended to depend from amended claim 7 and the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 is traversed.

#### *Claim Rejections -35USC § 103*

Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener et al. in view of Brinskele in United States Patent No. 5,553,124.

Claim 3 is amended to depend from claim 7. Claim 6 depends from amended claim 3. The rejection of claims 3 and 6 is thereby traversed.

The Office Action rejected claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener et al. in view of Nagata et al. in United States Patent No. 6,181,680. Claim 13 is amended to incorporate subject matter deemed allowable in claims 5 and 7. No combination of Wiener et al. and Nagata et al. teach or suggest the invention claim in amended claim 13 and the rejection of claim 13 is thereby traversed. Claim 15 is amended to accord with the subject matter of amended claim 13 and the rejection of claim 15 is likewise traversed.

The Office Action rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener et al. in view of Nagata et al. and further in view of Lynch et al. in United States Patent No. 5,649,005. Claim 14 depends from amended claim 13. For reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 14 is traversed.

DOCSOTT: 304512\1

Commissioner for Patents  
Page 13

Serial No.: 09/642,671

The Office Action rejected claims 16, 17, 22, 24 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener et al. in view of Lynch et al. Claims 16 and 17 are cancelled and the subject matter thereof incorporated into amended claim 18, deemed allowable. The rejection of claims 16 and 17 is thereby traversed.

Claims 22 and 24 are amended to depend from amended claim 18 and the rejection of claims 22 and 24 is traversed.

Claim 25 was deemed allowable if amended to incorporate all of the features of claim 16. Claim 25 has been amended accordingly and it is therefore in a condition for allowance. Claim 26 depends from claim 25. Claim 27 is amended to depend from claim 26 and claim 28 depends from amended claim 27. The rejection of claims 26-28 is thereby traversed.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener et al. in view of Lynch et al. and further in view of Brinskele et al. Claim 21 is amended to depend from amended claim 18, deemed allowable. The rejection of claim 21 is thereby traversed.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claims 34-39 have been allowed.

The Office Action objected to claims 7-12, 18-20, 23, 25 and 29-33 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7-12, 18-20, 23, 25 and 29-33 have been amended accordingly and the objection is traversed.

In view of the cancellation of claims 1, 5, 16 and 17 and the amendment of claims 7, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21-25, 27 and 29, claims 2-4, 6-15 and 18-38 remaining in this application are considered to be in a condition for immediate

DOCSOFT: 304512\1


Commissioner for Patents  
Page 14

Serial No.: 09/642,671

allowance. Favourable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance  
are therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alexander C. Lang

By

  
Max R. Wood  
Registration No. 40,388  
Attorney for Applicant

MRW/ma

Address: OGILVY RENAULT  
1981-1600 McGill College Ave.  
Montreal Québec  
H3A 2Y3  
Canada

DOCSOTT: 304512\1